

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,972	08/29/2001	Yoshihide Murakami	213338	7743
23460 7.	7590 02/23/2005		EXAMINER	
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD			REDDICK, MARIE L	
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/941,972	MURAKAMI ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Judy M. Reddick	1713			
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE - External control	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl o period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•					
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 N	lovember 2004.				
		o)				
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	•				
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1,4,6-9,12 and 14-16</u> is/are pending i	n the application.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·	•			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,4,6-9,12 and 14-16</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•			
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) _ acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se-	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document:)-(d) or (f).			
	2. Certified copies of the priority document		ion No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receive	•			
* 0	application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , ,	ad			
,	see the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	:a.			
Attachmen	nt(s)					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)			
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	(102)			
•		·— —				

Application/Control Number: 09/941,972 Page 2

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Amendment filed on 11/22/04 is sufficient to remove the rejection under 35 USC § 102 (b)/103 (a) over Otsuka et al (U.S. 4,608,249) as applied to claims 1 & 9 (08/16/04, paragraph no. 4) and the rejection under 35 USC 103 (a) over Otsuka et al (U.S. 4,608,249) in combination with Muraoka et al (U.S. 5,876,745) or Muraoka et al (U.S. 6,139,867) as applied to claims 2-8 & 10-16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited "glycerine ester of saturated fatty acid" per claims 6 & 14 constitutes indefinite subject matter as per the non-express establishment of proper antecedent basis. It is suggested that applicant replace "glycerine" with "triglycerine" so as to avoid any confusion.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12 & 14-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 & 10-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,787,681 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the adhesive layer mainly comprised of an acrylic polymer, a component compatible with the acrylic polymer and liquid or pasty at ordinary

Art Unit: 1713

trilaurate, glyceryl triisostearate and glyceryl trioleate and a chemical crosslinking agent such as an isocyanate compound and an organic peroxide per the claims of U.S. Patent '681 overlaps in scope with the adhesive composition for application to skin which comprises an acrylic copolymer(100 parts by weight) obtained from a monomer mixture comprising a (meth)acrylic acid alkyl ester monomer(40 to 80 wt %), an alkoxy group-containing ethylenically unsaturated monomer(10 to 60 wt %) and a carboxy group-containing ethylenically unsaturated monomer(1 to 10 wt %) and a triglycerine ester of a saturated fatty acid having 8 to 10 carbon atoms (20 to 120 parts by weight) which is liquid or paste at room temperature, wherein the acrylic copolymer has a gel fraction of 30 to 80 wt % per the instantly claimed invention with the understanding that the acrylic copolymer of U.S. Patent '681 meets the acrylic copolymer of the instantly claimed invention as expressly taught at col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-19 & 38-67 and col. 6, lines 1-3 of U.S. Patent '681. Furthermore, the contents of the acrylic copolymer and the monomer components making up the acrylic copolymer per U.S. Patent '681 are generic and therefore necessarily imply that any content, including the claimed contents, would have been operable within the scope of the claimed invention. As to the gel content, such would be considered to be an inherent property of the acrylic copolymer of the claims of U.S. Patent '681, as modified or not to involve anything unobvious.

Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12 & 14-16 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 5 & 10 of copending Application No. 10/443,844.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the
adhesive layer formed from a resin composition comprising an acrylic acid ester polymer, a carboxylic acid ester
having 16 or more carbon atoms which is compatible with said acrylic acid ester polymer and is liquid or paste at
ordinary temperature and a crosslinking agent per the claims of copending application '844 over laps in scope with
the adhesive composition for application to skin which comprises an acrylic copolymer(100 parts by weight)
obtained from a monomer mixture comprising a (meth)acrylic acid alkyl ester monomer(40 to 80 wt %), an alkoxy
group-containing ethylenically unsaturated monomer(10 to 60 wt %) and a carboxy group-containing ethylenically
unsaturated monomer(1 to 10 wt %), a triglycerine ester of a saturated fatty acid having 8 to 10 carbon atoms (20 to
120 parts by weight) which is liquid or paste at room temperature, wherein the acrylic copolymer has a gel fraction
of 30 to 80 wt % per the instantly claimed invention with the understanding that the acrylic copolymer and

carboxylic acid ester having 16 or more carbon atoms of copending application '844 meet the acrylic copolymer and triglycerine ester of the instantly claimed invention as expressly taught at pages 11 & 12 and page 14, lines 6-22, respectively, of copending application '844. Furthermore, the contents of the acrylic copolymer and the monomer components making up the acrylic copolymer per copending application '844 are generic and therefore necessarily imply that any content, including the claimed contents, would have been operable within the scope of the claimed invention. As to the gel content, such would be considered to be an inherent property of the acrylic copolymer of the claims of copending application '844, as modified or not to involve anything unobvious.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
Relative to the OTDP Rejection----The Obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1,4, 6-9, 12
& 14-16 over claims 1 & 10-14 of U.S. Patent 6,787,681 B2 (U.S. copending 10/317,076) set forth supra is deemed proper, herein maintained and necessitates an acceptably filed Terminal Disclaimer so as to remove this rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Judy M. Reddick whose telephone number is (571) 272-1110. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/941,972 Page 5

Art Unit: 1713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Judy M. Redduk
Judy M. Reddick
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1713

JMR Jme 02/21/05